

unbelievably tense game. Ohio State entered the game at least an 11½-point underdog. The team's defense was certainly key in putting Ohio State into a position where they could win the game. During the first overtime, the game was tied 17 to 17. Then facing what could have been the end of the game—fourth down and 14 yards to go—Ohio State completed a 17-yard pass to stay alive.

I know Ohio State fans, whether they were in Tempee, AZ, or whether they were, as I was, watching TV in Cedarville, OH, just could not believe what had happened. Ohio State's quarterback faded back and made that unbelievable pass on fourth down and 14. After a few more plays, the Buckeyes scored from the 1-yard line to go into that second overtime.

Then in the second overtime, Ohio State scored on a rushing attempt, and this proved to be the last score of the game. Miami got the ball, of course, and then on the last play of the game, fourth and goal at the 1-yard line, the Buckeyes blitzed and forced Miami's quarterback to rush his pass in desperation, allowing the Buckeye defensive linebacker to bat it down to the ground. This moment secured Ohio State as the 2002 national champions and gave the team a place in history. Without a doubt, both teams played well; both teams are great champions.

Many sports writers already have made the case that Ohio State's 31-to-24 double overtime victory in this year's Fiesta Bowl was the greatest championship game in the history of college football. This sort of fantastic finish was the same type of dramatic conclusion to many of the Buckeyes' wins this season.

The truth is Ohio State was underestimated the entire season, but because the players worked together as a team to overcome huge obstacles, they were able to reach their ultimate goal. The unselfish attitude of the players and coaches resulted in win after win for their team.

The Ohio State University football team defied history and odds to win 14 games in one season, overcoming all barriers along the way to persevere in the end.

I wish to conclude with the words of former Ohio State national champion coach, Ohio legend, the late Woodrow Wayne Hayes—Woody Hayes. I quote Woody Hayes:

Anytime you give a man something he doesn't earn, you cheapen him. Our kids earn what they get, and that includes respect.

It is with great respect today that I say congratulations and go Bucks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Ohio State football team, coaching staff, and players be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

2002 OHIO STATE FOOTBALL TEAM ROSTER

John Adams, Tucker Allen, Will Allen, Tim Anderson, David Andrews, Kyle An-

draws, Redgie Arden, Bryce Bishop, Mike Bogart, Jason Bond, LeAndre Boone, Joe Bradley, Bobby Britton, Jason Caldwell, Bobby Carpenter, Drew Carter, Angelo Chattams, Bam Childress, Maurice Claret, Adrien Clarke, R.J. Coleman, John Conroy, Chris Conwell, Ryan Cook, Bryce Culver, Mike D'Andrea, Doug Datish, Michael DeMaria, Mike Doss, Ivan Douglas, T.J. Downing, Tyler Everett, Dustin Fox, Simon Fraser, Chris Gamble, Steve Graef, Cie Grant;

Marcus Green, Andy Groom, Maurice Hall, Roy Hall, Ryan Hamby, Rob Harley, Ben Hartsock, A.J. Hawk, John Hollins, Santonio Holmes, Andrew Hooks, Josh Huston, Harlen Jacobs, Michael Jenkins, Brandon Joe, Mike Kne, Craig Kolk, Craig Krenzel, Mike Kudla, Scott Kuhnhein, Maurice Lee, Jamal Luke, Nick Mangold, Thomas Matthews, John McLaughlin, Scott McMullen, Richard McNutt, Jeremy Miller, Brandon Mitchell, Steven Moore, Ben Nash, Donnie Nickey, Mike Nugent, Adam Olds, Shane Olivea, Pat O'Neill, Jim Otis;

Fred Pagac Jr., Roshawn Parker, Steve Pavelka, Joel Penton, Kenny Peterson, Scott Petroff, Quinn Pitcock, Robert Reynolds, Jay Richardson, JaJa Riley, Mike Roberts, Lydell Ross, Matt Russell, Nate Salley, B.J. Sander, Tim Schafer, Brandon Schnitker, Darrion Scott, Rob Sims, Antonio Smith, Troy Smith, Will Smith, Michael Stafford, Alex Stepanovich, David Thompson, Matt Trombitas, Jack Tucker, Kyle Turano, Andree Tyree, Jeremy Uhlenhake, E.J. Underwood, Chris Vance, Bryan Weaver, Stan White Jr., Kurt Wilhelm, Matt Wilhelm, Sam Williams, Steve Winner, Mike Young, and Justin Zwick.

Mr. DEWINE. I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENSIGN). The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Illinois I be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I say to my colleague from the State of Ohio, I tuned in to that game in the final minute of the regular game and was watching as one of the Miami running backs was injured. It appeared the game was going to end with Miami being the winner. I agree with the Senator from Ohio, it was one of the most exciting college football games I have ever seen. Of course, being from Illinois, since our signature university is one of the 11 members of the Big Ten, we are particularly proud that another team from the Big Ten is the national champion, and the Ohio State Buckeyes certainly did us proud that evening. I am sure Senator DEWINE is very happy about that outcome and proud of what they did as well.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, if my colleague will yield, I appreciate my colleague's comment. I just knew my colleague from Illinois, another Big Ten school, would be rooting for the Buckeyes that day.

Mr. DURBIN. I certainly was.

Mr. DEWINE. I appreciate that.

THE ECONOMY AND EDUCATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, we came back to Washington to be sworn in and

begin a new Congress, and the President traveled to my State of Illinois, to Chicago, to announce his proposal for an economic stimulus. We need it; we need it desperately. For the last 2 years, we have languished. Our economy has gone from bad to worst.

The President inherited a budget surplus, at least on paper, that gave us some opportunities to pay down the debt of the Nation. Instead of borrowing money from the economy to finance our Government, we were actually not borrowing at the same rate. I am careful with my rhetoric because I am being followed by Senator HOLLINGS who is the guru and past master when it comes to the questions of deficits and surplus. He will quickly disabuse me of my notions if I am wrong. He will concede, as I hope I would as well, that our budget situation today is worse than it was when President Bush took office in terms of the deficits we are generating.

That deficit situation reflects three situations, some of which we control and some we do not. No one could have anticipated the negative impact September 11 had on our economy and the increased expenses of Government for military and defense efforts. That is something for which no President can be held accountable because it was totally unexpected. That situation has added to our deficit.

The continued recession we are going through has made the deficit even worse: Fewer tax revenues going into Washington, fewer dollars available for spending on programs and a deficit as a result.

The third piece, though, has to fall on the President's lap. He came to us and said: I want to cut taxes, and if I cut taxes, this economy will turn around, trust me. The majority of the Senate and the House did—I was not one of them—and they were wrong.

The President's tax cut proposal did not invigorate the economy; it added to our deficit. So that red ink pool gets deeper and deeper. We are deeper in debt and the economy is still languishing.

The President came back this week and said: I have a brand new idea: More of the same. Let me cut taxes on the highest income people in America, and I swear to you, America, this time it is going to work; if you will just give the richest people in America a substantial tax break, we know they will do the right thing; we know they will invigorate the economy.

Isn't it interesting what the public reaction has been? CNN had a call-in and said to the American people: Do you buy the President's approach? Do you want to try this again or would you rather go for a different approach suggested by the Democrats, that we have a smaller more manageable stimulus package that helps us this year immediately and is focused on helping the majority of Americans, not just 1 percent of the wage earners, the wealthiest?

The CNN poll came back. Two to one, the people calling in said: We prefer the more managed approach, the smaller stimulus that does not add to the deficit and, frankly, tries to help all taxpayers, not just the wealthiest among us. Two to one, people rejected President Bush's failed economic policy which he is trying to bring back to us again.

Let me tell you what is interesting, too. President Bush suggests that in the course of this economic stimulus we can take out of the Treasury during the next 10 years—let me get the number correct—\$676 billion. Most of it is not going to happen in the first year, so it is not much of a stimulus package. It really does not happen at all. To suggest that people who receive corporate dividends this year will not have to pay taxes next year—of course, those are the wealthiest people in America as a class—it will not stimulate the economy. Most Americans say that does not make any sense at all. Why create a worse deficit for our country, more debt for our children, more competition for capital funds between business and Government with a program that won't work?

The President says we can take \$676 billion out of our Treasury for this experiment, the first phase of which has already failed. Taking that money out of the Treasury would, of course, mean less money available for America's priorities.

What would that be? Well, more compensation to provide for our military. We are about to go to war. I hope we do not. If we do, make no mistake, we will spend what is necessary to put our troops in the field and make sure they are adequately trained, have the right resources and technology to win, and come home safely. We will spend that money. And we should—every penny of it.

The President says as we take money out of the Treasury, it makes no difference. It does; more money spent on the military means less money spent elsewhere. For example, homeland security. We want to be safe in Illinois. Every person does. It costs money. We need a statewide communication network so all the first responders—police, fire, medical communities—can share in communications instantly. It will cost us \$20 million. We do not have it.

If the Federal Government wants to make America safer, wants real homeland security, start on the home front. When we take \$676 billion out for a tax break for wealthy people, the likelihood that Illinois will get \$20 million to be safer as a State is diminished dramatically.

Another area tells an important story about the priorities of this administration: education. When we take more money out for tax breaks for wealthy people, there is less money available to go into education. Remember a year ago? A year ago yesterday President Bush signed No Child Left Behind, the first and highest priority

of his new administration. When he was still in Texas before being sworn in, he called in the congressional leaders, Democrats and Republicans, and said: Put your party label aside; can't we all agree—Senator KENNEDY, Congressman GEORGE MILLER and the Republican leaders—on a bipartisan basis to do something meaningful for America's schools? He convinced them. He convinced me. He convinced the majority in Congress. We passed No Child Left Behind and said we would go after the 6 million-plus students in America who are falling behind in failing schools. We are going to not only find out what their current state of education is, we are going to help the school districts get back on their feet with better teachers, better classrooms, more technology, more time in the classroom, and better results. I cheered it on. We all did. It was a bipartisan approach. The President took great pride. This would be the centerpiece of his new administration. He was truly going to be an education President.

As soon as the floodlights had dimmed and the television cameras had left, we learned something in this town of secrets, about a secret that had been kept by the administration. The secret was this: The President was prepared to sign the bill to approve the plan. The President was not prepared to put the Federal dollars on the table to make it work. As a consequence, we stand here today with mandates from this No Child Left Behind on school districts in States across America and the Bush White House refuses to fund those mandates.

Pick your State. With very few exceptions, every State in the Union is in deep deficit. My home State of Illinois will swear in a new Governor on Monday. Congressman Rob Blajovich is leaving the House of Representatives to become our new Governor. He inherits a fiscal nightmare of a \$4 billion deficit. California has more than a \$30 billion deficit. These Governors who are required to balance their budgets will be scrambling to cut basic services or increase taxes. They have no other place to turn.

One of the major responsibilities of our State is education. At a time when the State of Illinois cannot afford to meet its basic obligation for education, we have a mandate coming from President Bush, a mandate under No Child Left Behind, which will add to the expenses of Illinois and every other State, but the President refuses to put the money on the table to fund his own education program.

Take a look at some of the charts to get an idea of the priorities of education by this Bush administration. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the basic bedrock of helping failing schools and students improve, is a part of the Federal budget which reflects the priorities of the administration. Under the Clinton administration, the average amount of in-

crease each year was 22.3 percent. In comes President Bush, the education President, proposing a 3.6-percent increase. Thank goodness Congress refused, denied him, and increased it to 20 percent. This tells you about the priorities.

Look at the increases in education over the last 7 years, overall spending in education, and you see double digits, but for 1 year, until we come to President Bush; his increase was 2.8 percent in education. The education President will not put the money on the table. Under the Bush administration, we have the smallest increase for education in 7 years.

Now take a look at what the Bush budget has done. Because he cuts back on education increases, because he will not fund his own No Child Left Behind, 18,000 teachers were cut from professional development to improve their skills in the classroom; 20,000 students lost college work-study programs; 25,000 limited-English-proficient children were cut from the Federal bilingual education programs; 33,000 kids cut out of afterschool programs; no increase in Pell grants; no increase in student loans. Is this the education President?

No child left behind? Look who is being left behind. Not only the children but the teachers—and the Nation.

If you take a look at President Bush's budget, he promised 6.7 million children would be rescued by No Child Left Behind. In fact, they have not been. They have been left behind themselves. The President said we were going to have 2 million more children protected this year. In fact, there are only 354,000.

When it comes down to it, you have the Bush administration on the one hand posing for pictures and shaking hands with school principals across America and with the other hand reaching into their pockets and pulling out their State funds to fund his unfunded mandate under No Child Left Behind. We will have States paying for the testing required by the Federal Government and not paid for, paying for the evaluation of students required by the Federal Government and not paid for, teacher certification and improvement required by the Federal Government and not paid for, paraprofessionals improving skills required by the Federal Government and not paid for—along series of unfunded mandates from this President.

What will it mean in the States across the Nation? Read the bad news. I have it here. State after State is seriously considering, and some already deciding, to go to a four-day school week because they cannot afford to keep the schools open while President Bush sends unfunded mandates under No Child Left Behind.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DURBIN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. REID. The Senator has outlined what we have required States to do as a result of Federal legislation. What if school districts decide not to do this?

Mr. DURBIN. They could face a cut-off of the existing Federal funds they are receiving. You have States that could be penalized, States that already are in trouble because of State deficits. They could be penalized by not complying with the Federal mandates that President Bush created, signed, and refused to fund.

Now, let me tell you where I stand. Senator KENNEDY, who is not with us today but he certainly has been our leader on this issue, has called for full funding under title 1, full funding under the IDEA program for disabled students, and those are things I support. It comes to about \$7 billion, if I am not mistaken. We should come up with that money. If we can find \$676 billion for tax breaks for wealthy people, can we not find \$7 billion for education?

It is my position—and I do not speak for anyone but myself on this—if this Congress fails to fund the unfunded mandates of No Child Left Behind, this Senator will propose suspending those mandates, saying to those school districts across America that until we are prepared to put the money on the table, until this economy is stronger, we are not going to require you to test every student every year to make an evaluation of each of those students and go through all the requirements of No Child Left Behind.

The President cannot have it both ways. He cannot call himself an education President, wrap himself in the cloak of educational reform, and then refuse to put the money on the table. That is what he has done, year after year after year.

There are those who believe the way to stimulate America's economy is to make sure a majority of tax breaks go to a majority of Americans who believe that we should invest, as well, in the education of our children. Is there anything more important? This administration makes it the lowest priority. It should be our highest. That investment by our Nation at this moment in time will not only help us through the current recession but it will also help us for generations to come.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended for 20 minutes, and that the additional minutes be evenly divided between the Democrats and the Republicans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from South Carolina be recognized for 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. HOLLINGS. I commend our distinguished friend from Illinois. He has

brought into sharp focus our dilemma with respect to the prime initiative of President Bush with respect to education.

I just finished a column for the local newspaper relative to symbols versus substance. You will find our Republican colleagues very strong on symbols but very weak on substance itself.

Let me ask the question, rhetorically, of course: What Governor, what mayor—all of us are facing these deficits—is cutting taxes in the face of these deficits? With voodoo? In other words, all you have to do to fix the deficit is cut your revenues. We heard this under President Reagan, and Vice President Bush called it voodoo. We heard all you needed to do was to cut taxes and the people would have so much money they would spend and everything else. We would have consumer demand. You would have sales tax revenues. You would have income tax revenues, they would all increase, and we would just grow out of a deficit.

At that time Vice President George Herbert Walker Bush, Bush No. 1, called it voodoo.

We just had, last year and the year before, of course, voodoo II. A tax cut of \$1.3 trillion plus interest costs \$1.7 trillion. We are cutting the revenues and at the same time in the 4 years, and I want my colleagues to check the record and mark it down, the defense budget has gone in the last a little over 3, nearer 4 years from 1998 until now, from \$271 billion to at least \$371 billion. It will probably be nearer \$386 billion. We have increased defense costs \$100 billion. We have increased health costs \$107 billion, when you look at Medicare and Medicaid and the veterans. But that does not include the community health centers or child health care, of course. So we spend another \$200 billion there. We have increased agriculture, farm subsidies another \$35 billion.

While we are increasing the spending that both sides of the aisle support—health care, defense, and agriculture, some \$235 billion—and then we cut the revenues \$1.7 trillion, in voodoo, and we end up with a deficit. We are just like the States. Only there is no serious purpose up here for the needs of the country. It is only for the needs of the campaign.

We have been using this Congress and the White House to campaign. The heck with the country. Despite having just completed one election, we're already looking at the next election. And the blooming media has gone along with us. They treat politics as a spectator sport, where they want to know who is up, who is down, who is announcing, who is quitting, who is doing this, and who is doing that. You can't get their attention on paying the bill.

As a result, the debt has soared to \$6.3 trillion. We will be debating next month about increasing the debt limit. I want to see how many of my colleagues will vote for that. They have increased the debt by cutting all the

revenues, increasing all the spending, and saying: I am against the Government, the Government is too big, the Government is not the solution, the Government is the problem.

I have sent to the desk a value-added tax. I want to increase taxes. I am sober. I am experienced. I got a triple A credit rating back in 1959 for the little State of South Carolina. I know what you have to do to pay the bill. I have been the chairman of our Budget Committee up here in the National Government, in the Senate. I can tell you, this is about my third try for a value-added tax.

My bill will be referred to the Finance Committee. I know revenue measures under the Constitution derive in the House of Representatives. But I know also that we had a hearing back in the 1980s when we had this voodoo. Lloyd Bentsen of Texas was chairman of that committee. I brought Dr. Cnossen, the Hollander expert. He testified, because he knew he had helped the United Kingdom. He had written a value-added tax for Japan, for Canada—every industrialized country in the world save the United States has a value-added tax. That is one of the big deficiencies we have in international trade.

They have a 15 percent to 17 percent advantage with their VAT. We have the disadvantage. When Dr. Cnossen testified, as they were leaving the room—I will never forget—former Senator John Chafee turned to Lloyd, the chairman, and he said, “Lloyd, if we had a secret ballot we would vote it out of this committee unanimously.”

We needed the money to balance the budget. We tried with Gramm-Rudman-Hollings and had a temporary restraint on the Federal budget. But then instead of a prompter, a sword to prompt fiscal responsibility, it was used as a shield. We needed to take extreme action. But we didn't take it, and Gramm-Rudman-Hollings was out by 1992. Bush I was running a \$400 billion deficit and lost office to the Governor of Arkansas.

Let's get to the Governor of Arkansas. When Clinton got nominated, his friend Erskine Bowles from Charlotte got together business leaders and market experts. They went down to Little Rock. Along with them was Alan Greenspan. Greenspan told then-Governor Clinton—he said, When you come to Washington you are going to have to not only cut spending, you are going to have to increase taxes.

Clinton said, Are you serious?

He said, The country needs it. We are not going to have any investment, we are not going to have any jobs, until the Government starts paying down the debt.

And paying down the debt was the 8-year chant on the floor of the Senate. You can't hear it now. You can't hear it now, about paying down the debt. You have to have tax cuts and so forth. One side says let's have, I don't know, a \$700 billion, \$800 billion, \$900 billion